



**SUMMARY
AD HOC CITIZEN TRAILS TASK FORCE
MEETING #8
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2008
CITY OF SCOTTSDALE WATER CAMPUS
8787 E. HUALAPAI DRIVE
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA**

PRESENT:

| | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Jean Anderson | Pat Hill | Linda Meredith | Robin Scotford |
| Marilyn Andrews | Lou Ann Hillman | Morely Meredith | Randi Smelko |
| Joan Cardell | Shelly Hook | Howard Myers | Judy Wagman |
| Sue Cardell | Tracey House | Susan Pensiero | Susan Wheeler |
| Karla Crall | Jan House | Copper Phillips | Linda Whitehead |
| Cindy Dalgarn | Matt Kalina | Judith Robertson | |
| James Flynn | Janice Kruglick | Amanda Rutherford | |
| James Heitel | Jill Loskill | Ira Schulman | |

STAFF:

Dave Meinhart, Transportation Planning Director
John Schultz, Transportation
Jesus Murillo, Planning and Development
Annie DeChance, Public Participation and Outreach Manager
Susan Conklu, Transportation Planner
Reed Kempton, Principal Transportation Planner
Denise Labrecque, ADA Coordinator
Doris McClay, Planning and Development

ALSO PRESENT: Theresa Gunn, Independent Facilitator

TABLE DESIGNATION

- A Table 1 participant (left/front) = 7 members (1 departed at 7:47 p.m.)
- A member from Table 2 (left/back) = 7 members (1 departed at 7:32 p.m.)
- A participant from Table 3 (right/back) = 7 members (1 departed at 7:28 p.m.)
- A Table 4 member (right/front) = 7 members (1 departed at 7:47 p.m.)
- Reporter table = 1 member (departed at 7:05 p.m.)

1. Welcome and Announcements

Ms. Gunn called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m. Ms. DeChance read a list of the Task Force's accomplishments:

- Made recommendations to Council on right-of-way
- Is in the process of drafting the design guidelines matrix
- Reviewed new information on equestrian guidelines
- Discussed costs, trail maintenance, and multi-use trails versus equestrian-only trails

She thanked the Task Force members on behalf of the City for taking the time to participate in the planning process. Based on her observations, the decision to split up groups at the last meeting helped level the playing field, foster more dialogue, and allow a greater voice for those who have not participated as much so far.

2. **Response to member feedback**

- Revised meeting schedule

Ms. Gunn acknowledged comments made that previous discussions on prioritization felt rushed. She said that, based on those concerns, more time will be given to the Task Force to accomplish its goals. A Table 1 participant asked why the schedule was changed from the first and third Mondays to the second and fourth Mondays. Ms. DeChance explained that January 19 is a City holiday. Ms. Gunn asked whether the Task Force preferred to change it back to the old schedule. One Table 1 participant wanted to return to the old schedule, but the remainder felt that January 5 would follow too soon after the holidays.

- Revised agenda

Ms. Gunn reviewed the list of tasks remaining to the group. She asked the Task Force to decide how it wanted to proceed. A Table 1 participant said the abandonment and design guidelines were of immediate importance, since the City has current cases that would touch upon both issues. A participant from Table 3 felt that the funding, enforcement and maintenance issues should wait until the prioritization process was complete. A member from Table 2 said funding is an important topic, since not enough money is going to be available for all the trails right away. The City would have to make creative use of what it has now, and then grow the system over time. Funding is important enough to place before prioritization.

Mr. Meinhart said that much of the available funding is tied to a couple of the top master plan projects currently in design. Council directed that the rest of the funds be applied to the Mescal Park issue and Desert Foothills trails. Staff is hoping to receive guidance on what to prioritize when the next wave of funding becomes available. A Table 1 participant felt that other issues should come before funding, because the amount of funding required would depend on how the other issues are addressed.

Ms. Gunn noted that the Task Force would first discuss the abandonment issue, followed by design guidelines, trails prioritization, funding, enforcement, and maintenance. In response to a participant from Table 3, Ms. Gunn said equestrian trail classification would fit into the design guidelines discussion.

Ms. Gunn acknowledged that some concern has been raised regarding a comment she made about the Task Force having an equestrian bias. She said the groups were initially pretty well balanced, but have become more weighted towards equestrians recently. She said she does not intend to overemphasize the imbalance, nor manipulate the group to overcome it. The

Task Force moves in its own direction, and she has no ulterior motive. Her goal is to ensure that the tasks are completed in the most efficient manner possible.

3. **Abandonment**

- Update on current cases

Ms. Gunn reviewed the recommendations that the Task Force made at its previous meeting. A Table 4 member said that until money is available, the City is not going to be able to do anything about rights-of-way. If this recommendation is adopted, abandonments will be placed on hold until a trail is identified. A participant from Table 3 clarified that abandonment can still take place a number of ways, including abandoning a right-of-way in return for an easement, which gives property owners more setback. Either an easement or a right-of-way has to be in place for implementation. It has to be locked in now so that it does not disappear later. Abandonment could be allowed provided that an alternate trail alignment gets implemented. If the easements are not there, the City is unlikely to ever get them later. A member from Table 2 emphasized that should be noted in the recommendation. A participant from Table 3 asked about connectivity. A Table 1 participant responded that connectivity is part of the trails plan. The alternate alignment should also maintain connectivity.

Ms. Gunn summarized the current recommendation. An acceptable alternative solution would be when the City has an easement or right-of-way that maintains the intent and connectivity of the original trail. A member from Table 2 asked about abandonments that are already in place. A Table 1 participant said the City would have to buy them back in those cases. Mr. Murillo explained that once an abandonment is approved, the City could not go back and reclaim it again without compensation. A member from Table 2 asked how many abandonments the City currently has under consideration. Mr. Murillo responded that he is currently responsible for six in the northern area.

A participant from Table 3 asked whether the City's website offers information on areas that have been granted abandonment. Mr. Murillo said his staff is currently conducting that research. He explained that the Planning Commission makes the initial recommendation to City Council. If the City decides it cannot grant a request, the applicant has to decide whether to take it to Council with the negative recommendation, or work out an agreement to obtain a positive recommendation. The Table 3 participant asked about the amount of information that Council receives during hearings. Mr. Murillo explained that he presents detailed information to Council. He goes through a checklist to ensure that every pertinent issue is covered and the Transportation Department is closely involved.

Another participant from Table 3 inquired about the average investment a person would spend on an abandonment request. Mr. Murillo said that in the thirty cases he has handled, the average case takes about nine months. It costs \$1,200 for the application, and they must pay an engineer to draw up documents, which could cost from \$1,500 to \$3,000. Sometimes they also secure counsel or other representation.

A member from Table 2 asked whether easements have to be dedicated before water and sewer lines are installed. Mr. Murillo said the easements would have to be in place before the City could do something like that. If easements are not in place, the City would have to go back and ask for them. A member from Table 2 asked whether utility easements could be used for trails. Mr. Murillo explained that it depends on the language. Specific dedications

can change from one easement to another. Part of his review process includes obtaining clearance letters from every utility that would require the space. What distinguishes right-of-way from an easement is whether the space has been specifically reserved for vehicle or other modes of travel. An easement is a piece of property that has been reserved for specific uses. Right-of-way comes to the City in several different forms, and each has to be handled in a different way. An easement that is dedicated by the property owner contains different language depending on what it is being used for. Sometimes the easement's language forces it to be abandoned rather than released, even if the original intent was to allow people to walk on it.

A Table 1 participant reminded the Task Force that just because a utility easement exists does not mean that it can be used for a trail. Mr. Murillo said the City updates its language all the time, so that when it acquires an easement, it knows exactly what it is getting.

A participant from Table 3 asked if a utility had to restore an easement to its original condition if it wanted to work on it. Mr. Murillo said it depends on the language that was used when that easement was dedicated. A participant from Table 3 asked how a motorized right-of-way could be converted to a non-motorized one for equestrian use. Does the language have to be rewritten? Mr. Murillo said the City has the right to use right-of-ways for public mobility without having to rewrite them to specify equestrian use.

A participant from Table 3 asked whether GLO easements would have to be changed to specify non-motorized use. Mr. Murillo explained that the GLO language is currently under review by the Legal Department. A participant from Table 3 asked how trails could be determined if no answer was available. Mr. Meinhart responded that a trail can still go in a GLO easement without it having to be rewritten, because non-motorized use is still considered transportation. The wording does not have to be changed in a GLO to allow for only one form of transportation.

A Table 1 participant asked about situations where there has been a dedicated public right-of-way, and a public trail has been built on it. How does the City view an abandonment request for part of such a right-of-way? Mr. Murillo explained that in an easement form of ROW, the City has the rights to use the land for that purpose. Many times people ask for an abandonment of an easement so they do not have to pay taxes on something they cannot use. When the City has right-of-way, it has the right to reserve any of the easements on it, because it owns all the rights.

A Table 1 participant said that every property owner around a GLO has the right to use it to access his or her property. Just because the City has no interest in putting a road there does not mean that the local owners have given up their rights. A participant from Table 3 asked how a non-motorized trail would be placed in a GLO. The Table 1 member responded that local property owners have rights beyond the City's perspective. The Table 3 member noted that a trail could be designated non-motorized, but there would be nothing stopping a local property owner from riding motorized vehicles on the GLO. The Table 1 participant responded that the difference is that it is not a public street. The Table 3 member concluded that it would create an unenforceable situation.

The Table 1 participant said the GLO issue has been going on for a long time. A city may agree to abandon its interest, but the Federal government has dedicated rights for the entire public. The public could say it has the right to use all GLO roads for motorized use. The only way that could be enforced is with a lawsuit. The Federal government gave property owners

rights of access, but it does not specify whether it is for motorized use or not. Municipal governments have tried to avoid disputes between neighbors by abandoning them. GLOs are both good and bad for trails. The participant from Table 3 said it would affect enforcement. She suggested the Task Force prioritize trails on right-of-ways, and leave GLOs on the back burner. GLOs are not the optimum way to go.

A Table 1 participant said if an abandonment goes through, the City would reserve the right for a non-motorized trail easement. Presumably, property owners who dedicate a non-motorized trail would not tolerate motorized vehicles on it, and would have the right to block them. A participant from Table 3 asked whether a process existed to abandon the actual GLO. Several Task Force members said the Federal government would not want to get involved in that either.

A member from Table 2 asked who would be expected to cover the cost of removing an obstruction on a GLO after it was abandoned by the City, especially in cases where the property owners were granted permission to do so. Mr. Murillo said as far as the City is concerned, if it has abandoned its interest in a GLO, it becomes a civil matter.

A Table 1 participant said trails were planned for roadway corridors in order to avoid situations like this. GLOs can be used to cut across property, but if no road is present, it is difficult to use, enforce, and maintain. The ideal time to install a trail is when the City builds a road. Some people want to combine adjoining lots, and a trail on a GLO would prevent them from doing so. GLOs have created a legal nightmare that neither the City nor the Federal government want to get involved in.

- Develop agreement on task force recommendation

Mr. Kempton reviewed the available options:

1. The Transportation Department could issue a policy that will recommend denial of any request to abandon or vacate rights of way that could be used for trails, paths, sidewalks or other non-motorized connections unless a specific constructible, alternative alignment has been identified and acquired, or a determination has been made that the property will not be needed for future projects. Any such determination must be supported by documentation.
2. The Transportation Department policy will be to retain a minimum of 15 feet of non-motorized public access easement. He explained that this would remove the tread surface issue from the equation and make it clear that it could be used for a wide variety of non-motorized uses.
3. City Council denial of any request to release easements or vacate rights-of-way. It could be used for trail or path development unless a specific constructible alternative alignment has been identified and acquired, or a determination has been made that the property will not be needed for future projects.

A participant from Table 3 noted that option 2 would negate the design guidelines. A participant from Table 3 said options 1 and 2 were preferable because they focus on Transportation Department policy rather than City Council policy. Mr. Kempton said Option 3 requires City Council deliberation and approval. A participant from Table 3 said there are advantages to Option 2 because easements would be retained whenever something is abandoned. The only question is whether to retain the abandoned width of the easement, or a minimum width such as 25 feet.

In response to a second participant from Table 3, Mr. Kempton said he was referring to easements, not to GLOs or rights-of-way. For example if the City was being asked to abandon a GLO, it could require a trail easement in return. If a property owner owns two adjoining parcels that include 66 feet of GLO easement, under the current policy, the City could ask for a total of 15 feet of that in return for abandonment. Nothing in the guidelines states that the City could ask for two adjoining 15-foot easements.

Mr. Meinhart said it is a little challenging to always assume that all of an easement is going to be placed on one property. The City is looking to provide additional connections to neighborhood trails in GLO areas where there are no street plans. Should the City ask for 25 feet from each of those properties? He reminded the Task Force that the City does not have to abandon anything. A participant from Table 3 said that would only happen in situations where a trail or easement goes between two properties. If it is next to a road or a PUE, that situation would not apply. Mr. Meinhart said it is much more straightforward if the properties are on one side or the other of a roadway. The City has dealt with situations in which it can get half on one property, but has to try to acquire the half in another.

One member from Table 2 said requiring a 15-foot minimum would be dependent on the neighborhood in question and what the situation is with the road. A participant from Table 3 noted that large parcels keep areas like Desert Foothills horse-friendly, but property owners who have more than one piece would be prevented from joining them together. A Table 1 participant said that if properties are being adjoined, the City could abandon a piece that goes through the middle of it in exchange for an easement where the road is going to be. Twenty-five feet is nothing on large parcels, especially if right-of-way is being given back. That would allow the property owner to move all their setbacks, and allows a trail that would be to the benefit of everyone else.

A member from Table 2 said the Task Force needs to keep in mind that by the time an owner of a 1.25-acre property gives away a GLO and all the setbacks and easements, it would leave no room to put up a corral. A participant from Table 3 said a certain portion has to be given up for right-of-way anyway for utilities and roads. The parcels are 1.25 acres to allow room for that right-of-way. The proposal is to simply take some of that right-of-way and use it for trails.

A second participant from Table 3 noted that the City is not taking anything away from the owners. The City already has it. The owners are looking to claim more property back through the use of abandonment. They cannot use that property anyway, because they have to allow setback. A third member from Table 3 said easements and rights-of-way follow with the land, not with the particular owner. If an owner buys up three or four contiguous properties, they already know that the easements are there. If they do not like having a GLO go through their property, they should buy different property. The Task Force should not be working to protect owners who want to have all their easements abandoned; it should be protecting the trails so that developers do not tear down all the horse properties in order to build condo complexes or gated communities. A fourth Table 3 member said rights-of-way allow the City to expand growth by making roads bigger. If a trail is not built along the road, then the space would be used for more lanes.

A participant from Table 3 said the Task Force must remember that this policy is not going to affect every property. The City needs an outline to determine whether the trails plan can be effective if a certain right-of-way or easement is abandoned. She suggested removing the requirement for 15 feet, and basing it on the design guidelines.

Ms. Gunn asked whether the Task Force wanted to have the Transportation Department and/or Council develop a policy. A Table 1 participant recommended Option 2, reserving the right to change the 15 feet to whatever the easement needs to be in order to make a safe trail according to the design guidelines. A second member from Table 1 suggested combining the options together. The language in Option 1 allows flexibility to respond to owners who want to join parcels together. He agreed that the width requirement should be changed to conform with the design guidelines. Mr. Meinhart said it is usually preferable to have the policy refer to the guidelines, rather than putting a specific number directly into the policy. The guidelines are simpler to update. Ms. Gunn asked whether anyone disagreed. A member from Table 2 expressed concern about the word "constructible" because pretty much anything is constructible if enough money is thrown at it. A Table 1 participant said constructible infers that the City is not going to grant an infeasible alignment. Ms. Gunn suggested "reasonably constructible." The Task Force disagreed.

A member from Table 2 suggested that the City in general adopt the policy, instead of specifying a particular department. A Table 4 member suggested that Option 1 be applied wherever possible, otherwise, Option 2 be.

"The City should issue a policy that would recommend denial of any request to abandon or vacate rights of way that could be used for trails, paths, sidewalks or other non-motorized connections unless a specific constructible, alternative alignment has been identified and acquired, or a determination has been made that the property would not be needed for future projects. Any such determination must be supported by documentation; otherwise a non-motorized public access easement that is consistent with current design guideline specifications is required"

A member from Table 2 expressed concern that nothing in the language mentioned reasonable cost. He suggested adding the word "feasible." Mr. Kempton said such language could potentially give developers a loophole to get out of building a trail completely by arguing that it is going to cost too much. Mr. Meinhart said the larger question should be whether it functions adequately as a part of the trail system. Mr. Kempton said the City sometimes requires tunnels and bridges from builders that can be expensive. Money is not always the overriding concern.

A member from Table 3 said the builder could argue that the first option is not constructible because of cost, and they could request the second option. Mr. Kempton said when he was preparing the options; he did not see them as being a choice between one or the other. Option 2 was proposed strictly to set a distance. One Table 4 member said that the Task Force was spending too much time discussing something that is not going to happen. Builders are not going to be building master planned communities given the state of the economy. A member from Table 2 said the policy is still going to apply many years from now when the economy could be very different.

Ms. Gunn asked whether the Task Force wanted to change the language to include monetary feasibility. The majority of the group wanted to leave it as is. A member from Table 2 noted that the recommendation is not going to be law, it is simply meant to establish a tone. The Legal Department will determine the exact language. A Table 4 member said that the Task Force has to be specific in some instances. If it does not set a precedent now, it will have nothing. Eventually the money is going to be available to do many of these things. Ms. Gunn

asked her if she wanted to make changes. The participant from Table 4 responded that she thinks it is going in the right direction.

A second member from Table 4 suggested adding "per trail guidelines specifications" after "alternative alignment." Mr. Kempton said this covers abandonment requests where an alignment has already been selected.

Mr. Kempton felt that the word "otherwise" was unnecessary. Mr. Meinhart added that Mr. Kempton was looking at the recommendation from the perspective that the remaining easement would be used by the City to build the actual trail, as opposed to the trail being built by the person requesting the abandonment.

A Table 1 participant said the recommendation is not about building trails, it is about alignment. If land is going to be abandoned, there must be some place to put the trail. Cost or construction issues are addressed elsewhere. A member from Table 2 suggested switching the first and second paragraphs. Ms. Gunn reminded the group that this was not an either/or proposition. A participant from Table 3 asked whether the policy only referred to future projects. Mr. Kempton responded that if it does not show up on the Trails Plan, the Transportation Master Plan, the General Plan, or some other document, the City would be in a weak position. Mr. Meinhart reminded the Task Force that the City would be deciding whether to abandon its land. It is not a case of denying somebody the use of their own land.

Ms. Gunn summarized her understanding of the group's intent. If somebody requests abandonment of right-of-way, the City is going to deny it as long it still needs it for a future project, or at minimum maintain an easement to do the trail, unless the person requesting the abandonment provides an alternative easement. The owner has to either grant the easement consistent with the design guidelines in the current location, or provide an easement in an alternative location that still meets the design guidelines and connectivity with the trails system. Mr. Kempton felt the first paragraph was unnecessary. The second option was included to establish dimensions, but those are going to be changed in the design guidelines.

A Table 1 participant said that ever since the Trails Plan was approved in 2004, the City has granted abandonments without question, unless there was a line on a map to support it. The City cannot predict the future however, and should retain an interest in all abandonments. Does the Task Force want to continue what has not worked in the past, or does it want to provide for future unknowns? A participant from Table 3 noted that in some places it is already known.

Ms. Gunn summarized the group's view that it does not want the City to deny all abandonment requests. It is saying that abandonments should be exchanged for non-motorized public access easement, according to the Design Standards and Policy Manual. A Table 1 participant said the onus is on the owner to prove the City does not have it, not on the City to prove that it does. Mr. Kempton said he would like the policy to be broad enough so that there is only one policy for non-motorized public access including trails. In most cases, it is straightforward. A Table 1 participant said it can be retained as an easement; it does not need to be a right-of-way.

Ms. Gunn asked whether Mr. Murillo was getting the answers he was looking for. Mr. Murillo said the policy is getting close. He expressed concern about the use of the term "denial," because due process guarantees that cases will be heard and a decision made. As a

planner, he wants to understand the kind of advice he should give citizens who come to him to request abandonment in all types of situations.

A participant from Table 3 said that the City should definitely ask for an easement. Mr. Meinhart said he feels that that element is missing from the current draft of the recommendation. It does not specify that right-of-way be exchanged for an easement. A Table 1 participant suggested that the City can give up right-of-way, as long as a trail easement is provided in its place. The only condition where it would not apply is where a trail already exists, or when the City has all the easements, it needs to build the trail in its planned alignment.

Mr. Meinhart said the current recommendation suggests that the City is either agreeing to vacate rights-of-way, or it is not. It contains no mention of vacating the right-of-way while maintaining an easement.

Ms. Gunn verified that the group's intent is to allow the City to abandon right-of-way as long as it maintains a non-motorized public access easement, unless the trail is already completed in that area, or there is a land acquired, or other easements for that trail. The Task Force was largely in agreement. Ms. Gunn said staff would work on the exact language while the group recessed.

4. **Break**

Following the break, Ms. Gunn asked the Task Force to read the newly crafted recommendation. Ms. Gunn noted that instead of recommending denial, it requires that the City retain an easement. Instead of saying "constructible," it says "acceptable to the City" in terms of whether it meets the intent of the Trails Plan, provides connectivity, and can be built. The group agreed with the more positive language. Mr. Kempton said it met his needs. Mr. Murillo said it would give him the power to determine whether a property owner is meeting the requirements of the Trails Plan.

In response to a participant from Table 3, Mr. Meinhart explained that since this is a case where someone is asking to receive land that is currently controlled by the public, it does not have to be identified on a defined plan. The issue is whether the City wants to give away all of its land rights or not. Mr. Kempton said the language gives staff a lot more flexibility.

Hearing no opposition to the new language, Ms. Gunn declared that consensus had been reached on this issue.

The City policy will be to retain a nonmotorized public access easement meeting the requirements in the Design Standards Policy Manual in response to any request to abandon or vacate rights of way that could be used for trails, paths, sidewalks, or other nonmotorized connections unless a specific, alternative alignment acceptable to the City has been identified and acquired, or a determination has been made that the property will not be needed for future projects. Any such determination must be supported by documentation.

5. **Design Guidelines Matrix**

- Complete the boxes

Ms Gunn reviewed the design guidelines matrix. In the previous meeting, the Task Force had worked through the first several categories. She noted that the Task Force chose to use national trail guidelines for setbacks for neighborhood/local trails less than 10 feet in width; however there are no guidelines for that circumstance. Mr. Kempton explained that the existing design guidelines from AASHTO (American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials) are specifically for paved facilities that are designed for much higher speeds. Ms. Gunn asked the group what it wanted to do in that case. A participant from Table 3 said she sees these trail types as being in well-developed areas. There might not be much room available. To require minimum widths might prevent trails from being feasible in those places. Ms. Gunn asked whether it would be acceptable to leave it at maximum distance feasible. A Table 4 member suggested it identify a desired width of 10 feet, with no minimum. The group agreed.

Ms. Gunn noted that there were no changes to the vegetation clearance category. She asked whether decomposed granite was the preferred surface treatment across the board. A participant from Table 3 said DG is preferable unless a better surface treatment becomes available in the future. A Table 1 participant suggested DG or comparable treatment. A second Table 1 member said in some cases native material would be the best alternative. The current guidelines have it now. A participant from Table 3 said that if a trail can be stabilized using native material, it should be used. A third Table 1 participant said the existing guidelines say to use native material if possible. Ms. Gunn summarized the group's consensus on the category as acceptable native material or DG.

Mr. Meinhart requested clarification on horizontal vegetation clearance. The various national guidelines typically require two feet on each side of the trail. Most guidelines identify that at least some width off the edge of the trails not be planted. Scottsdale currently allows plants three feet or less in height immediately adjacent to the trail. Small plants often become big plants, however. A Table 1 participant suggested a two-foot minimum, with three feet desired.

A Table 4 member said the group had also discussed that plants be no taller than three feet, within three feet of the trail. A participant from Table 3 asked about spiny plants. A Table 1 participant noted that everything in the desert is spiny. A member from Table 2 said the original discussion was to disallow any new spiny plants within five feet of the trail. The Task Force agreed. Ms. Gunn summarized that vertical clearance would be 12 feet desired, with a 10-foot minimum, horizontal clearance would be three feet desired, with a two-foot minimum. No plants taller than three feet within three feet of the trail, and no new spiny plants within five feet.

Ms. Gunn said the Task Force had not yet come to an agreement on tread width for neighborhood/local trails. A Table 1 participant said she has a trail in her neighborhood which is about two feet wide. It is perfectly fine for her horse. A neighborhood trail does not need to be any wider than that. A Table 4 member said that might be fine for horses, but would not work for ADA.

A Table 1 participant said many existing trails could never be ADA because of the topography. Mr. Kempton said some trails actually serve the purpose of a sidewalk in some neighborhoods. Such trails are not considered equestrian trails, and would have to comply with ADA. ADA is the law; it is not optional for these trails. That does not mean that the City cannot create another category of trail. ADA requires a three-foot minimum, as long as there are passing zones. It specifies that trails built prior to 1992 do not have to be rebuilt to

conform to the ADA standard, but that the City is required to put in place an ADA transition plan.

A Table 4 member noted that if the width was six feet, there would be no need for passing lanes. A participant from Table 3 said six feet would not always be feasible. A second member from Table 3 said new trails should have five feet as a minimum, and eight feet would be desired.

Mr. Kempton explained that the City would have to include a line in the Design Standards and Policy Manual that says the City will meet all applicable ADA guidelines. A participant from Table 3 said the minimum should be the applicable ADA guideline, with eight feet desired. She would not want to see trails disappear from neighborhoods that could not meet that requirement. Mr. Kempton said six feet would be more practical in most applications.

A Table 4 member asked what would happen in cases where the trail would not fit. Mr. Kempton said that if a 25-foot wide corridor had to be narrowed to get past an obstacle that might be acceptable, even if it would not be acceptable for the whole length. A participant from Table 3 said establishing a desired width is fine, but City planning should be allowed flexibility so that trails are not abandoned because the desired width is not met. A Table 4 member said safety and suitability are the two primary characteristics for any trail.

Ms. Gunn asked the group for a consensus recommendation. A member from Table 2 said the minimum should be the ADA requirement of three feet. Several members indicated that three feet was not wide enough for equestrian uses. A participant from Table 3 suggested six feet, but would accept five. If a corridor does not allow that, then an alternative route should be found. Mr. Kempton said a 6-foot width makes it much easier to get equipment in for maintenance. A second member from Table 3 expressed concern that a neighborhood that does not have that much room would never get a trail at all.

A Table 4 member said the point is to make it so that existing neighborhood trails do not have to be abandoned because they are only three feet wide. It is better to have a three-foot wide trail in some areas than to have it closed entirely. Mr. Kempton noted that trails that were built under the standards of the day are still fine. Staff is primarily looking at new and reconstructed trails. Mr. Meinhart explained that the logic for a six-foot width is that in many cases, the trail serves as a sidewalk. The minimum width for sidewalks in Scottsdale's design standards is six feet.

Ms. Gunn summarized a consensus at a minimum six-foot width, with a desired width of eight feet, and a maximum width at whatever was possible.

Ms. Gunn inquired what roadway crossover standards the group preferred for neighborhood/local trails. A member from Table 2 said it should have a non-skid/non-slip surface like the national standards. A member from Table 2 said crossings should be designated across the road itself, so that drivers know it is a crossover spot. A member from Table 2 suggested removing the requirement that trail users may only cross at intersections. A Table 4 member said crossings should be uniform and have curb cutouts to accommodate all users.

Ms. Gunn asked the Task Force consider whether future design guidelines should be determined by adjacent land use, rather than by trail types. A participant from Table 3 said something has to be done to the concrete used on Cactus corridor crossings, because it is too

slippery for horses. A member from Table 2 said placing crossings only at intersections would be safer for pedestrians, but may be impractical in some places such as on Dynamite. Logic has to be used. The group decided to leave that item off.

Ms. Gunn summarized that for neighborhood/local trails, trails should have crossing signs, non-skid/non-slip surfaces, and the crossing should be designated on the street surface. Mr. Meinhart said staff mainly wanted to know how often it would be acceptable to switch from one side of the road to the other.

The Task Force indicated that it had enough for one day. Ms. Gunn assigned the group members to individually fill in the roadway crossovers, grade, cross slope, and easement width categories on the matrix. Proposed new trail classifications should identify a name, a definition, and suggested design guidelines. The results of this work would be the starting point for the next meeting.

Mr. Kempton recommended that the group look at a new Forest Service category called "pack and saddle." He estimated that the majority of Scottsdale's trails would fall under Class 4 according to the Forest Service, with some others under Class 3.

- Decide if a new trail classification for equestrian only trails should be added
- Discuss possible future modifications to design guidelines

6. **Trail Prioritization**

- Should trails be prioritized by character area instead of systemwide - or other alternative?

7. **Next Meeting:** Monday, December 1, 6:00-8:30 p.m.
Jewish Community Campus, 12701 N. Scottsdale Road

Ms. DeChance offered meeting packets for members who missed any. Ms. Gunn said the next meeting would focus on finishing the design guidelines, and begin work on trails classification and how to prioritize trails.

With no further business to conduct, the meeting adjourned at 8:51 p.m.

SUBMITTED BY:

A/V Tronics, Inc.